

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,741	05/03/2001	Jose Gabriel Menchero	VTEK-120	8036
7590 08/15/2006			EXAMINER	
Alfred A. Equitz			NGUYEN, NGA B	
GIRARD & EQUITZ LLP 400 Montgomery Street, Suite 1110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Francisco, CA 94104			3628	
			DATE MAILED: 08/15/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,741	MENCHERO, JOSE GABRIEL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nga B. Nguyen	3628
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a retion. It period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed or Za) This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final. Allowance except for formal matt	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examplication Papers 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 7-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Example and the propers is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	ithdrawn from consideration. and/or election requirement. aminer. accepted or b) objected to to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	. □	(070.446)
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/25/06</u>. 	48) Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/848,741 Page 2

Art Unit: 3628

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the Amendment filed on April 25, 2006, which paper has been placed of record in the file.

2. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments/Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments that Maggioncalda fails to teach or suggest a processor which performs any arithmetic performance attribution computation, and fails to teach or suggest a processor which performs the operations specifically recited in any of claims 7-10 as amended, Maggioncalda also fails to teach or suggest a computer readable medium which contains instructions for programming a processor to perform any arithmetic performance attribution computation, and fails to teach or suggest a computer readable medium which contains instructions of the type specifically recited in claims 11-14 as amended, Examiner submits that the claimed invention recites an intended use, although Maggioncalda fails to discuss the intended use which is to perform an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, including by determining coefficients of a specifically recited type, and determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way using these coefficients, Maggioncalda's computer system and computer readable medium is capable of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation and displaying a result of the arithmetic

Application/Control Number: 09/848,741 Page 3

Art Unit: 3628

performance attribution computation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maggioncalda's to include the feature above for the purpose of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way and displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation.

"The recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable." *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

4. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maggioncalda et al (hereinafter Maggioncalda), U.S. Patent No. 5,918,217.

Regarding to claims 7-14, Maggioncalda discloses a computer system and computer readable medium, comprising:

a processor programmed to perform an arithmetic performance attribution computation to determine portfolio performance (figure 2, processor 202; column 6, lines 25-42);

a display device coupled to the processor arithmetic performance attribution computation for displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation (figure 1, display 221; column 6, lines 45-55).

Examiner submits that the claimed invention recites an intended use, although Maggioncalda fails to discuss the intended use which is to perform an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, including by determining coefficients of a specifically recited type, and determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way using these coefficients, Maggioncalda's computer system and computer readable medium is capable of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation and displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Maggioncalda's to include the feature

Art Unit: 3628

above for the purpose of performing an arithmetic performance attribution computation in a specific way, determining portfolio relative performance at a specific way and displaying a result of the arithmetic performance attribution computation.

"The recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable." In re Schreiber, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 1-6 are allowed over the prior arts of cited record.

Conclusion

- 8. Claims 1-6 are allowed.
 - Claims 7-14 are rejected.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Nga B. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on (571) 272-6799.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to: Art Unit: 3628

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

C/o Technology Center 3600

Washington, DC 20231

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communication intended for entry),

or

(571) 273-0325 (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Knox building, 501 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, First Floor (Receptionist).

NGA NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

July 7, 2006